



ARLINGTON FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
TOWN HALL LYON'S ROOM
7:30 PM 4/26/16

ATTENDEES:

Deyst*	White*	Caccavaro*	Kellar*	McKenna*
DeCoursey*	Wallach*	Harmer*	Gibian	
Tosti*	Foskett*	Bayer*	Duvadie*	
Russell*	Beck*	Jones*	Deshler	
Franclemont*	Howard*	Fanning*	Carman*	Turkall*

*Indicates present

VISITORS: Selectman Dan Dunn, Minuteman Superintendent Ed Bouquillon, Minuteman Assistant Superintendent Kevin Mahoney, Minuteman School Committee Member from Arlington Sue Scheffler, Member Minuteman School Building Committee Nawwaf Kaba, Michael Ruderman

MINUTES of 4/25/16 accepted as printed. Unanimous.

ART 31 LOCAL OPTION TAXES: VOTED no action since no new options are known.

Unanimous

STM ART 6 MINUTEMAN SCHOOL BOND AUTHORIZATION: Tosti provided additional documents:

A memo (Ref 1) from Town Counsel stating that a vote to approve the bond contingent on a debt exclusion override referendum in June would be legal. The memo contains wording for such a vote.

A letter (Ref 2) from Minuteman Bond Counsel Richard Manley stating that such a vote by Town Meeting, would require a yes referendum result, even if taking place after the MSBA deadline, in order to approve the bonds.

A listing (Ref 3) of the 5 Minuteman District communities that have approved the bond so far and the plans of the other 11 members

A spreadsheet (Ref 4) showing debt assessment of \$1,731,153 if there were no out of district students in 2020. Arlington students would be 34.3%.

A spreadsheet (Ref 5) showing debt assessment of \$1,262,192 with 170 out of district students in 2020 as projected by Minuteman.

Dunn, who chaired the Arlington Minuteman Task Force, reviewed this morning's meeting of this group which, after much discussion and the presence of most of its members, voted 8-1 for a yes vote contingent on a debt exclusion override recommendation to the FinCom. He also went over his rationale (Ref 6) for supporting the build because, he said, it is the best and most likely outcome.

Scheffler stated that the operating budget is down and the new school will strengthen Minuteman.

Members questioned Bouquillon and stated their concerns. There were several themes in this discussion. The per-student cost is high, and with debt payments included, will be higher. Similar numbers for a new AHS are not available. Concern was expressed with the risk of operating an under-enrolled school and the resulting cost. The impact on the DESE rule barring some out of district 9th graders. The limitations of the renovate-in-place study. The impact of this debt exclusion on others for AHS, middle school, Thompson and the eventual operating override.

VOTED No action on Minuteman Project 8 yes - 10 no.

VOTED Authorize the bond contingent on a debt exclusion 10 yes – 8 no

Tosti to prepare a vote for Town Meeting based on the wording in Ref 1.

COMMITTEE: The next meeting is 4/27/16,

RESERVE FUND Balance \$422,607

Peter Howard 4/27/16 Revised 4/27/16

Ref 1 Heim to Chapdelaine, Vote Regarding Authorizing Debt For Minuteman School Building Project, 4/26/16

Ref 2 Manley to Bouquillon, 4/26/16

Ref 3 Town Meeting Action On Assessment & Bonding 4/26/16

Ref 4 Capital Assessment Model no out of district students

Ref 5 Capital Assessment Model 170 out of district students

Ref 6 Arlington's Decision on Minuteman Build Proposal



**Town of Arlington
Legal Department**

Douglas W. Heim
Town Counsel

50 Pleasant Street
Arlington, MA 02476
Phone: 781.316.3150
Fax: 781.316.3159
E-mail: dheim@town.arlington.ma.us
Website: www.arlingtonma.gov

To: Finance Committee;
Adam Chapdelaine, Town Manager.

From: Douglas Heim, Town Counsel

Date: April 26, 2016

Re: Vote Regarding Authorizing Incurring Debt for Minuteman School Building Project

I write to provide further information regarding Special Town Meeting Article 6 – Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical School: Bond Authorization For Minuteman School Construction; as well as a recommended vote which approves Minuteman’s proposal to proceed with the project and incur debt under G.L. c. 71 §16(d) *contingent upon a successful debt exclusion vote in Arlington*.

As the Finance Committee may recall, on or about March 16, 2016, Minuteman Regional School Committee notified Minuteman member communities of their vote to authorize appropriation and borrowing for the purposes designing, constructing and originally equipping a new regional vocational school pursuant to process outlined in §IV (I) of the revised Regional Agreement¹ and M.G.L. c. 71 §16(d). Under such process, the debt proposed by Minuteman is deemed approved unless the Town Meeting of any Minuteman member community votes to

¹ The new Regional Agreement was signed by the Commissioner of Education at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education on or about March 11, 2016, and its provisions for Minuteman incurring debt govern the proposed action before Town Meeting.

disapprove such proposal within sixty (60) days of the Minuteman School Committee's vote. It must be noted that no vote whatsoever was required of Town Meeting by Minuteman's notice under either the Regional Agreement or G.L. c. 71 § 16(d). The lack of a Town Meeting vote equates to constructive approval for each community.

However, the matter being placed before Arlington Town Meeting, a vote of approval or disapproval should be acquired. That said, it is my understanding that Arlington's Minuteman School Building Task Force has recommended support for the project, but contingent upon a successful debt exclusion ballot question on June 14, 2016. After consulting with Minuteman's bond counsel, Rick Manley, Esq., it is my opinion that a "contingent -yes" vote is feasible without exposing Arlington to substantial risk.

I recognize the view others have expressed that on its face, G.L. c. 71 §16(d) suggests that only an outright vote of disapproval insulates the Town from incurring its allotted share of debt for the project. Yet in the most practical terms, if bond counsel will not authorize the sale of bonds to finance the project because Arlington's vote is structured in a manner which asserts a failed debt exclusion at the ballot invalidates Arlington Town Meeting's prior approval, Minuteman will not be able to proceed with the project and Arlington will face no debt for same. To that end, this Office requested bond counsel provide his opinion specifically to the Town of Arlington stating that he would not construe a "contingent-yes" vote as sufficient to proceed with borrowing should an Arlington debt exclusion question on this project fail to pass. Bond counsel is willing to provide such an opinion; and only because Mr. Manley is willing to provide such an opinion, am I confident that the "contingent-yes" vote is a safe course for Arlington.

Additionally, please permit me to also note the following:

1. A "contingent-yes" vote which failed to pass at Town Meeting is sufficient to register Arlington's disapproval for the purposes of G.L. c. 71 §16(d); and
2. A "contingent-no" vote (a vote in which Town Meeting disapproves the project unless a debt exclusion ballot questions passes), in my opinion, adds a layer of uncertainty under the Regional Agreement and c. 71, which could permit the Minuteman School Committee to call for a District-wide ballot question on the project under G.L. c. 16(n). While it may seem functionally similar to the "contingent-yes," such a vote would lead with the presumption that Arlington disapproves the debt, and at the very least permits the argument that the Minuteman District may pursue their other options if they are so inclined even as a ballot question is scheduled in June.

Based on the foregoing, if the Finance Committee agrees with the recommendation of the Arlington Minuteman School Building Task Force, I recommend the following “contingent-yes” vote for Town Meeting as drafted by bond counsel to assure Arlington will not assume unnecessary risk:

VOTED: That the Town hereby approves the \$144,922,478 borrowing authorized by the Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical School District (the “District”) on March 15, 2016, for the purpose of paying costs of designing, constructing and originally equipping a new district school to be located at 758 Marrett Road, Lexington, Massachusetts, including the payment of all costs incidental or related thereto (the “Project”), which school facility shall have an anticipated useful life as an educational facility for the instruction of school children of at least 50 years, and for which the District may be eligible for a school construction grant from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (“MSBA”), said amount to be expended at the direction of the School Building Committee; that the Town acknowledges that the MSBA’s grant program is a non-entitlement, discretionary program based on need, as determined by the MSBA, and any Project costs the District incurs in excess of any grant approved by and received from the MSBA shall be the sole responsibility of the District and its member municipalities; that any grant that District may receive from the MSBA for the Project shall not exceed the lesser of (i) forty-four and seventy-five hundredths percent (44.75%) of eligible, approved project costs, as determined by the MSBA, or (ii) the total maximum grant amount determined by the MSBA; and that the amount of borrowing authorized by the District shall be reduced by any grant amount set forth in the Project Funding Agreement that may be executed between the District and the MSBA. This approval shall be conditioned upon a successful vote of the Town to exempt its allocable share of debt service on this project from the limitation on total property taxes set forth in M.G.L. c. 59, s. 21C (also known as Proposition 2 1/2).

Ref 2



Locke Lord
111 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02199
Telephone: 617-239-0100
Fax: 617-227-4420
www.lockelord.com

Richard A. Manley, Jr.
Partner
Direct Telephone: 617-239-0384
Direct Fax: 866-658-1046
richard.manley@lockelord.com

April 26, 2016

Edward A. Bouquillon, Ph.D.
Superintendent
Minuteman Regional Vocational
Technical School District
758 Marrett Road
Lexington, Massachusetts 02421

Dear Ed:

I understand that at least one of the District's member towns may condition its town meeting approval vote of debt authorized by the District upon the passage of a debt exclusion ballot question related to its share of such debt, as permitted by M.G.L. c. 59, s. 21C(k) (also known as Proposition 2 1/2), and that the debt exclusion election is likely to be held on date that falls outside of the 60-day time frame established by M.G.L. c. 71, s. 16(d) for member towns of a regional school district to approve debt authorized by a regional school district. As bond counsel to the District, you have asked for our opinion as to the consequences of an approval or disapproval of debt under such conditions.

The regional school debt authorization mechanism is set forth in M.G.L. c. 71, s. 16(d), which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

... written notice of the amount of the debt and of the general purposes for which it was authorized shall be given to the board of selectmen in each of the towns comprising the district not later than 7 days after the date on which the debt was authorized by the district committee; provided further, that no debt may be incurred until the expiration of 60 days after the date on which the debt was authorized; and provided further, that before the expiration of this period any member town of the regional school district may hold a town meeting for the purpose of expressing disapproval of the amount of debt authorized by the district committee, and if at that meeting a majority of the voters present and voting express disapproval of the amount authorized by the district committee, the debt shall not be incurred. . . (emphasis added).

The effect of M.G.L. c. 71, s. 16(d) is that if a member town does not approve or disapprove of the debt within the 60-day window set-out in M.G.L. c. 71, s. 16(d), the debt is approved. This provision pre-dates the adoption of Proposition 2 1/2. Since the adoption of Proposition 2 1/2, it has become common practice for towns to condition their approvals of debt for substantial

AM 57740102.1

Atlanta | Austin | Boston | Chicago | Dallas | Hartford | Hong Kong | Houston | Istanbul | London | Los Angeles | Miami | Morristown
New Orleans | New York | Providence | Sacramento | San Francisco | Stamford | Tokyo | Washington DC | West Palm Beach

projects upon the passage of a related debt exclusion ballot question. Indeed, M.G.L. c.59. s.21C(m) provides an express mechanic for towns to approve borrowings contingent upon approval of a debt exclusion question, as follows:

A town may appropriate . . . from borrowing, contingent on the passage of a ballot question under paragraph (g), (i1/2) or (k), but: (1) the statement of the purpose of the appropriation shall be substantially the same as the statement of purpose in the ballot question; (2) the appropriation vote shall not be deemed to take effect until the approval of the ballot question; (3) no election at which the question appears on the ballot shall take place later than the September 15 following the date of an appropriation vote adopted at an annual town meeting, or 90 days after the date of the close of any other town meeting at which an appropriation vote was adopted . . .

In many cases, towns will not schedule a local election for consideration of a debt exclusion question until the results of voting at town meeting have been determined. Once the selectmen have voted to place a debt exclusion question on the ballot for an election, a warrant will need to be prepared, and the town clerk needs to be notified to order ballots and make the other arrangements necessary for the conduct of a local election. More often than not, this process will occur outside of the 60-day approval period for regional school district debt established under M.G.L. c.71, s.16(d). As counsel to most regional school districts in the Commonwealth, it has been our experience that a large majority of regional school debt approvals are conditioned upon the passage of debt exclusion votes, and that well over half of those occur outside of the 60-day window established by M.G.L. c.71, s.16(d).

We understand that the plain language of M.G.L. c.71, s.16(d) calls for approval or disapproval within 60 days after the regional school district's vote to authorize debt, however, if a regional school borrowing approval is conditioned upon passage of a debt exclusion question, which is closely analogous to the mechanic for approving other borrowings subject to passage of debt exclusion votes described above, and where a date for the election is either known, or promptly established for the conduct of a debt exclusion vote after the conclusion of town meeting, we simply cannot render an approving opinion under current professional standards for rendering municipal bond opinions until such time as the results of the debt exclusion vote are known. To approve a borrowing where a town has conditioned its approval of regional school debt upon a debt exclusion vote outside of the 60-day approval period of M.G.L. c.71, s.16(d), based solely upon the theory that the town has neither expressed approval or disapproval within the 60-day approval period, overlooks the reality of the local election and runs the almost certain risk of a legal challenge to the validity of the bonds in the event that the town votes to disapprove the debt exclusion.

Please let me know if we can provide you with anything further.



Richard A. Manley, Jr.

Minuteman Regional High School
Projected FY20 Revenue Plan and Assessments
New School Building Project

Assumes Total Enrollment of 628 In-District Students - 34.3 Percent of Students from Arlington

Revenue Plan	FY20 PROJECTED	REVISED AGREEMENT	Min. Reg. Contribution	Transportation	Other Operating Assessment	Debt/Capital	Total Assessments
Non-Assessment Revenue		Acton	799,986	92,044	315,880	489,765	1,697,675
Chapter 70 State Aid	3,454,311	Arlington	2,843,473	327,161	1,122,766	1,891,302	6,184,702
Transportation Reimbursement	635,907	Belmont	689,729	79,358	272,344	497,525	1,538,956
Non-Member Tuition	(509)	Bolton	214,711	24,704	84,780	174,484	498,680
Non-Member Capital Fee	(217)	Boxborough	-	-	-	3,717	3,717
E & D Contribution	100,000	Carlisle	-	-	-	3,717	3,717
Total - Non-Assessment Revenue	4,189,492	Concord	465,069	53,509	183,636	417,736	1,119,951
		Dover	27,357	3,148	10,802	88,752	130,059
Assessment Revenue		Lancaster	875,425	100,724	345,668	517,386	1,839,202
Minimum Required Contribution	8,290,346	Lexington	1,442,461	165,965	569,566	994,105	3,172,098
Transportation	953,860	Lincoln	-	-	-	6,691	6,691
Debt	5,821,550	Needham	595,223	68,484	235,028	461,642	1,360,377
Assessments over Minimum Contribution	3,273,503	Stow	336,912	38,764	133,032	249,448	758,156
Total = Assessment Revenue	18,339,259	Sudbury	-	-	-	16,357	16,357
		Wayland	-	-	-	3,717	3,717
		Weston	-	-	-	5,204	5,204
Total Budget	22,528,751	Total	8,290,346	953,860	3,273,503	5,821,550	18,339,259
Tax Rate Impact - New School Building Project							
Assumptions:							
Debt Service effective FY20		Member	2014 Census	Projected	Residential	Estimated	Estimated
Projected Enrollment		Town	Median	Debt	Tax	Tax Impact	Tax Impact
(8% annual increase District enrollment - 10/1/17 & 10/1/18)			Home	Assessment	Impact	Per Med. House	Per \$100,000
In-District	628		Value				
Out-of-District	0	Acton	502,000	444,708	\$0.1102	\$55.34	\$11.02
	628	Arlington	507,200	1,731,153	\$0.2033	\$103.13	\$20.33
Inflation Rate - 2% Annually (FY18 to FY20)		Belmont	656,000	458,678	\$0.0695	\$45.60	\$6.95
For Foundation Budget, Transportation & Operating Assessment		Bolton	470,800	162,391	\$0.1738	\$81.80	\$17.38
Transportation Reimbursement = 60%		Concord	688,300	391,542	\$0.0670	\$46.13	\$6.70
		Dover	945,100	87,211	\$0.0368	\$34.83	\$3.68
<i>This model uses the formulas as required in the Revised Agreement and valid within the assumptions as disclosed.</i>		Lancaster	288,400	468,080	\$0.5564	\$160.46	\$55.64
<i>This is prepared in response to requested information by member towns and the assumptions used must be considered when analyzing projected future costs to each member town.</i>		Lexington	710,600	912,863	\$0.0711	\$50.52	\$7.11
<i>Five year model used to align with expected enrollment and debt planning. Subject to change as required.</i>		Needham	668,900	428,118	\$0.0359	\$24.00	\$3.59
		Stow	444,700	230,472	\$0.1921	\$85.44	\$19.21
		Total - Debt		5,315,217			

Page 4

Assumes Total Enrollment of 628 In-District Students - 34.3 Percent of Students from Arlington

Ref 4

**Minuteman Regional High School
Projected FY20 Revenue Plan and Assessments**

Ref 5

New School Building Project

<u>Revenue Plan</u>	<u>FY20 PROJECTED</u>	<u>REVISED AGREEMENT</u>	<u>Min. Req. Contribution</u>	<u>Transportation</u>	<u>Other Operating Assessment</u>	<u>Debt/Capital</u>	<u>Total Assessments</u>
Non-Assessment Revenue							
Chapter 70 State Aid	2,518,090	Acton	583,156	92,042	296,423	368,113	1,339,734
Transportation Reimbursement	635,907	Arlington	2,073,156	327,216	1,053,802	1,415,962	4,870,136
Non-Member Tuition	3,384,228	Belmont	502,945	79,382	255,651	372,613	1,210,591
Non-Member Capital Fee	1,440,365	Bolton	156,643	24,724	79,623	130,005	390,995
E & D Contribution	100,000	Boxborough	-	-	-	4,956	4,956
Total - Non-Assessment Revenue	8,078,590	Carlisle	-	-	-	4,956	4,956
		Concord	338,746	53,466	172,187	311,821	876,220
		Dover	19,820	3,128	10,075	64,579	97,602
Assessment Revenue		Lancaster	637,907	100,684	324,253	387,349	1,450,192
Minimum Required Contribution	6,043,416	Lexington	1,051,635	165,984	534,554	747,048	2,499,221
Transportation	953,860	Lincoln	-	-	-	8,921	8,921
Debt	4,380,968	Needham	434,068	68,511	220,640	344,571	1,067,790
Assessments over Minimum Contribution	3,071,917	Stow	245,340	38,723	124,708	186,372	595,144
Total = Assessment Revenue	14,450,161	Sudbury	-	-	-	21,807	21,807
		Wayland	-	-	-	4,956	4,956
		Weston	-	-	-	6,939	6,939
Total Budget	22,528,751	Total	6,043,416	953,860	3,071,917	4,380,968	14,450,161

Assumptions:

Debt Service effective FY20

Projected Enrollment

(8% annual increase District enrollment - 10/1/17 & 10/1/18)

In-District 458

Out-of-District 170

Inflation Rate - 2% Annually (FY18 to FY20) 628

For Foundation Budget, Transportation & Operating Assessment

Transportation Reimbursement = 60%

This model uses the formulas as required in the Revised Agreement and valid within the assumptions as disclosed.

This is prepared in response to requested information by member towns and the assumptions used must be considered when analyzing projected future costs to each member town.

Five year model used to align with expected enrollment and debt planning. Subject to change as required.

Tax Rate Impact - New School Building Project

	2014 Census						
Member Town	Median Home Value	Projected Debt Assessment	Residential Tax Impact	Estimated Tax Impact Per Med. House	Estimated Tax Impact Per \$100,000		
Acton	502,000	324,179	\$0.0804	\$40.34	\$8.04		
Arlington	507,200	1,262,192	\$0.1483	\$75.19	\$14.83		
Belmont	656,000	334,459	\$0.0507	\$33.25	\$5.07		
Bolton	470,800	118,443	\$0.1267	\$59.66	\$12.67		
Concord	688,300	285,229	\$0.0488	\$33.61	\$4.88		
Dover	945,100	63,423	\$0.0268	\$25.33	\$2.68		
Lancaster	288,400	341,102	\$0.4055	\$116.93	\$40.55		
Lexington	710,600	665,537	\$0.0518	\$36.84	\$5.18		
Needham	668,900	312,198	\$0.0262	\$17.50	\$2.62		
Stow	444,700	167,874	\$0.1400	\$62.24	\$14.00		
Total - Debt		3,874,635					

Minuteman Regional High School
Projected FY20 Revenue Plan and Assessments
New School Building Project
Assumes Total Enrollment of 628 In-District Students - 200 Students from Arlington

Revenue Plan	FY20 PROJECTED	REVISED AGREEMENT	Min. Req. Contribution	Transportation	Other Operating Assessment	Debt/Capital	Total Assessments
Non-Assessment Revenue							
Chapter 70 State Aid	3,454,170	Action	827,342	95,195	326,692	504,754	1,753,985
Transportation Reimbursement	635,907	Arlington	2,640,130	303,777	1,042,507	1,760,158	5,746,572
Non-Member Tuition	-	Belmont	718,482	82,670	283,707	516,131	1,600,988
Non-Member Capital Fee	-	Bolton	217,722	25,051	85,972	176,201	504,946
E & D Contribution	100,000	Boxborough	-	-	-	3,718	3,718
Total - Non-Assessment Revenue	4,190,077	Carlisle	-	-	-	3,718	3,718
Assessment Revenue		Concord	500,760	57,618	197,735	445,800	1,201,913
Minimum Required Contribution	8,290,008	Dover	21,772	2,505	8,597	81,491	114,365
Transportation	953,860	Lancaster	870,887	100,205	343,887	515,036	1,830,015
Debt	5,821,333	Lexington	1,534,938	176,612	606,100	1,054,610	3,372,261
Assessments over Minimum Contribution	3,273,472	Needham	609,621	70,144	240,721	471,602	1,392,088
Total = Assessment Revenue	18,338,674	Stow	348,355	40,082	137,555	256,143	782,135
		Sudbury	-	-	-	16,357	16,357
		Wayland	-	-	-	3,718	3,718
		Weston	-	-	-	5,205	5,205
Total Budget	22,528,751	Total	8,290,008	953,860	3,273,472	5,821,333	18,338,674
Assumptions:							
Debt Service effective FY20		Tax Rate Impact - New School Building Project					
Projected Enrollment		2014 Census					
(8% annual increase District enrollment - 10/1/17 & 10/1/18)		Member	Median	Projected Debt	Residential Tax Impact	Estimated Tax Impact	Estimated Tax Impact
In-District	628	Town	Home Value	Assessment	Impact	Per Med. House	Per \$100,000
Out-of-District	0	Action	502,000	458,155	\$0.1136	\$57.01	\$11.36
Inflation Rate - 2% Annually (FY18 to FY20)	628	Arlington	507,200	1,611,455	\$0.1893	\$96.00	\$18.93
For Foundation Budget, Transportation & Operating Assessment		Belmont	656,000	475,663	\$0.0721	\$47.29	\$7.21
Transportation Reimbursement = 60%		Bolton	470,800	163,938	\$0.1754	\$82.58	\$17.54
		Concord	688,300	417,596	\$0.0715	\$49.20	\$7.15
		Dover	945,100	80,264	\$0.0339	\$32.05	\$3.39
		Lancaster	288,400	465,984	\$0.5539	\$159.75	\$55.39
		Lexington	710,600	968,157	\$0.0754	\$53.59	\$7.54
		Needham	668,900	437,266	\$0.0366	\$24.51	\$3.66
		Stow	444,700	236,523	\$0.1972	\$87.69	\$19.72
		Total - Debt		5,315,000			
Five year model used to align with expected enrollment and debt planning. Subject to change as required.							

2

Arlington's Decision On the Minuteman Build Proposal

Outcome 1: Participate in the Building

1. Good outcome: Revenue and cost projections are relatively on point.
2. Great outcome: Other towns join the district
3. Bad outcome: School enrollment withers, or state undermines the out-of-district revenue stream, and costs increase

Outcome 2: Stop the Building

- A. Cheap renovation: It turns out to be possible to do a much smaller project without state money. This is a good outcome.
- B. Expensive renovation: Minuteman's estimates are right, and it costs a lot to do the renovation. This is a bad outcome - just as costly as the rebuild, but with a lesser educational experience.
- C. Dissolve district and sell assets, make new district?
 - a. Build voc into new Arlington and Belmont high schools?
 - b. Create Arlington/Watertown/Belmont/Lexington district?
 - c. Join SOLVE collaborative? Create our own collaborative?
- D. Find pot of state gold?
- E. Withdraw from district. Common wisdom is that DESE wouldn't let us leave the district, in which case we end up in A, B, or C. But if DESE did let Arlington leave the district, then we'd have to figure out where to place 115-175 high school students.

Why I Support the Building

In short, I support the building because I think that it has the **best and most likely outcome**. I think that the fears about the district's failure are overly conservative. Furthermore, I think that the no-building outcomes are likely to be bad ones. **I don't see a no-building outcome that I find both good and likely.**

I do understand that the building has financial risks for Arlington, and I respect the arguments against the building. This is a question where reasonable people can disagree. We can't see the future any better than the founders of Minuteman did almost 45 years ago could. We must gather the facts that we can, make our best estimates, and vote our consciences.

Enrollment Argument

- Enrollments at Minuteman are on the order of 700 students. The proposed school has a target of 628. The school can afford to lose some students, and must lose some students.
- I believe that a new building will increase its attractiveness and there will be an increase of in-district students. I don't believe Minuteman's projections, but it stands to reason that the effect will be non-zero and positive.
- The 9th grade exploratory year affects many out-of-district towns, but not all of them. Watertown, for instance, and does not have 5 programs, and their freshman are still eligible to attend Minuteman.
- Cost per student, capital v. non capital

The Alternatives

Outcomes A and B

Allan Reedy's analysis of the Minuteman renovation estimates suggests that there isn't a "cheap" renovation available. The actual cost is not clear.

The building is projected to cost \$145m, with state assistance on the order of 3x%. That leaves about \$100m that the district has to come up with. The plan is to pay for some of that with out-of-district capital assessments, and the rest from member towns. The non-state assisted renovation project is not eligible for out-of-district assistance. If the renovation costs \$80m, how much money did we save? And what did we get for our money?

Outcome C

There is no obvious path here. The remaining 10 towns are here because they want it to work, one way or another. There will be resistance to breaking it up and starting over. It's not clear how a process like this would be lead. It's not clear how to get to an outcome with a healthy-sized vocational school with a variety of educational programs.

Outcome D

There is no indication, after years of lobbying, that this has any chance of happening.

This document is a work in progress, and I'm updating it periodically.

Dan Dunn

Last updated: 4/19/16